

REPORT OF MEETING

PROJECT NO.: Reconstruction of Interchange 33 on I-95
CTDOT Project Nos. 138-248
STV Job No. 01-02508

DATE OF MEETING: June 16, 2016

FEDERAL AID PROJECT NO.: 0951(364) For PE

LOCATION: Baldwin Center, 1000 West Broad Street, Stratford, CT

PURPOSE: Public Informational Meeting

ATTENDEES:

Susan Libatique	CTDOT Highway Design	860-594-3179
Neil Patel	CTDOT Highway Design	860-594-3411
Ahsan Saghir	CTDOT Highway Design	860-594-2076
Denise Young	CTDOT Environmental Compliance	860-594-2686
Robert Ike	CTDOT Rights of Way	860-594-2409
Michael Chachakis	CTDOT Traffic	860-594-2750
Stephen DelPapa	CTDOT Environmental Planning	860-594-2941
Christine Tedford	CTDOT Environmental Planning	860-594-2928
Ron Curran	CTDEEP	860-424-3764
Jim DiLorenzo	USEPA	617-918-1247
James Sherwonit	STV Inc.	203-383-5120
Steven Scalici	STV Inc.	212-614-7624
Xi Zou	STV Inc.	212-505-4998

(see attached for list of Public attendees)

TRANSACTIONS AND DETERMINATIONS:

The project plans were displayed in the Baldwin Center, beginning at 6:30 p.m. for the informal question and answer session. There were approximately sixty (60) attendees, including Mayor John Harkins of Stratford and his Chief of Staff Mark Dillon, Town Engineer John Casey, Town of Stratford Economic Development Director Karen Kaiser, Council Member Tina Manus, Mayor of Milford Benjamin Blake, State Representatives Laura Hoydick, Kim Rose and Joe Gresko. The formal Public Informational Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

This meeting was held to continue the public outreach program and present an update on the status of the project plans. A presentation was delivered by the Connecticut Department of Transportation (Department) and the Department's consultant for the project, STV Incorporated. A summary of the meeting is as follows:

STV presented an overview of the project including the proposed improvements, traffic analysis, results of the Economic/Business Impact Analysis and the NEPA Reevaluation process, project costs and schedule. Additional improvements included in the project, subsequent to the public informational meeting in June 2014, were highlighted (i.e., modification to condominium driveways, noise walls and new sidewalks). The Department's Office of Rights of Way concluded the presentation with a review of the property acquisition process. Upon conclusion of the presentation, the floor was opened to the public for comments and questions.

Public Comments and Questions:

- 1. Comment: Willow St. Resident - Concerns were expressed about existing ground water contamination and in-home air vent systems, response by DEEP and potential issues from new construction.*
Response: DEEP noted that monitoring is being performed on wells and vent systems and this will continue. EPA/DEEP will continue to hold coordination meetings with the public on the progress of the Raymark



superfund site.

2. *Comment: It was stated that funding will be 90% federal and 10% state. Both the federal government and CT are broke. Where will money come from and is project a good way to spend money we don't have?*
Response: The project is included in the Department's five-year Capital Plan and the funds for construction are programmed for Federal Fiscal years 2017 and 2018. Construction funds will be released when the design is complete and all rights-of-way and environmental permits are approved.
3. *Comment: Taxes are too high – can state afford \$30 Million? Projects always go over budget.*
Response: Comment noted
4. *Comment: Traffic counts for the project were taken during construction of the Moses Wheeler Bridge and how does that relate to "normal" conditions?*
Response: Traffic projections were performed using standard CT DOT procedures that apply growth factors which account for land use, population growth, employment and census data.
5. *Comment: Please explain the improvements to the plan since the original concept plan in 2014.*
Response: The plans have been developed to a preliminary design stage which represents approximately 30% design effort. A noise analysis was completed and the preliminary locations of the noise walls were incorporated. Additional improvements on Veterans Blvd, Barnum Ave cutoff and the existing SB off-ramp were incorporated based on the traffic analysis and additional sidewalks are proposed for improved connectivity.
6. *Comment: Business/Property Owner from Devon (McDonalds and Tower Plaza) – Not sure why project is being built. Stated opinion that Devon businesses will be hurt and questioned the business survey since he was not contacted.*
Response: The project purpose and need was restated and STV confirmed that personnel at McDonald's were contacted and surveys were performed on that property.
7. *Comment: Money would be better spent on bridges that need work.*
Response: Comment noted
8. *Comment: Is this project a "done deal?"*
Response: CTDOT and FHWA have approved the project to move forward with final design and start acquisition of rights of way.
9. *Comment: Stratford Resident - Project is overdue for 60 years. Would help to relieve congestion and dangerous backups at exit 32 and other locations. Fully supports project.*
Response: Comment noted
10. *Comment: Devon Business owner (Gas Station) – Loss of traffic will hurt his business. He would not have installed new pumps if he knew this project was coming.*
Response: It was noted that although certain traffic will be diverted, additional traffic patterns to various destinations may replace the diverted traffic volumes.
11. *Comment: Stratford resident noted he was an Engineer and thought the proposed plan was absurd. Also noted concerns about where the money will come from.*
Response: Comment noted



12. *Comment: What is purpose and need for this project? Identified various business owners that were not surveyed and that survey included the wrong people. Also noted that studies show that slow traffic increases business opportunities.*
Response: The purpose and need was restated and it was noted that the Economic/Business Impact Analysis was very thorough in its approach and identified that many of the businesses in the corridor were the type that would not be affected by traffic diversions on U.S. 1.
13. *Comment: Stratford Resident (MBA Student) noted references to several studies that show boulevards are better in relieving traffic than adding lane and ramps to highways. Also noted that no peer review was performed on this design.*
Response: The comment was noted and it was stated that the project design was reviewed by various Department support units and FHWA. The FHWA has approved the Re-evaluation of the NEPA document. It was also stated that the original NEPA document in 2006 was performed by another consultant).
14. *Comment: Stratford Resident – Concern about costs. Money should be used for something else. Concern about Raymark Waste in general and project disturbance of the hazardous material. Noted that some existing stop controlled intersections worked fine now and thought the new signals proposed would make traffic worse.*
Response: Comment noted
15. *Comment: This project will bring more traffic to area along Ferry Boulevard and the existing off-ramp.*
Response: This proposed improvements will add more vehicles to the roadway network at Interchange 33, but the traffic will be better managed with the addition of the median barrier between the off-ramp and Ferry Boulevard, the modified traffic signals and an interconnect plan coordinating all the traffic signals in the area. This project will also relieve congestion at Interchanges 32 & 34.
16. *Comment: Stratford Resident – Noted his support for the project. Exit 32 backs up onto highway and causes a lot of accidents. He noted that there are a lot of Stratford Town supporters for the project.*
Response: Comment noted
17. *Comment: Village Square Resident – Supports the project and knows there will be temporary impacts. Businesses in Stratford will benefit.*
Response: Comment noted
18. *Comment: Milford resident – Traffic is not a big deal in Devon. Losing traffic will hurt businesses.*
Response: Comment noted
19. *Comment: Stratford Council Member – She noted that workers from Moses Wheeler frequented the local stores and that construction was good for the economy. Concerned with increased traffic at NB off-ramp and NB Ferry Boulevard. Also noted that when traffic backs up at the existing signal, people cut through the neighborhood. Need guarantee that Raymark Waste will not be impacted.*
Response: Comment noted, (traffic issue was addressed previously).
20. *Comment: Stratford Resident – questioned traffic numbers as they were presented (overall numbers and increases). Noted that traffic problems were being moved from Devon to exit 33 area.*
Response: STV reviewed traffic data and proposed improvements to the signal system timing in the whole Interchange 33 area including more than just the 4 signals noted in the presentation.



21. *Comment: Speaker welcomed the addition of sidewalks. Noted that Fitness edge has moved from the Marshalls complex to the Dock Shopping plaza after the traffic counts were done.*
Response: Comment noted
22. *Comment: Resident expressed concern over traffic accidents on the Moses Wheeler Bridge and that the NB on-ramp merge will increase the risk of accidents. Also questioned the steepness of the on ramp and the effect of slow trucks merging.*
Response: STV noted that the design of the ramp was extensively studied and modeled by the designer, CTDOT and FHWA as part of the Interstate Access Modification process.
23. *Comment: Resident noted that this project may have been needed back 15 years ago when it was initiated with AVCO and Sikorsky in operation, but does not make sense now.*
Response: Comment noted
24. *Comment: Is this project fully funded?*
Response: The project is programed to use federal and state funds for construction, but construction funding will be released upon completion of design and acquisition of all rights of way.
25. *Comment: Are there any total takes*
Response: No, only 4 partial takes and construction easements and rights to construct are required at this time.
26. *Comment: Resident of Stratford with a Business in Milford – Stated that he was not approached for business survey. Suggested local traffic improvements be studied/implemented rather than modifying the interchange. Lives in the area affected by Raymark but was not offer the air/vent system. Money should be spent to dredge the Housatonic River for boating.*
Response: Comments noted
27. *Comment: Milford Resident noted that there was a petition with 2000 signatures against the project. Residents don't have a voice. Noted 39 failures of vent systems in 6 months.*
Response: Comments noted.
28. *Comment: When there are incidents on I-95 traffic backs up on Route 1.*
Response: Comment noted.

The formal public informational meeting and question and answer session ended at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Submitted By: James E Sherwonit
James Sherwonit, P.E.

Date: 7/27/2016

Approved By: _____
Ahsan Saghir

Date: 7/28/2016

CC: Timothy M. Wilson – Susan M. Libatique – Nilesh M. Patel